



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,398	11/13/2001	Holger Bengs	114750.2600	4117

7590 10/18/2005

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
525 WEST MONROE STREET SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER

PRATS, FRANCISCO CHANDLER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/869,398

Applicant(s)

BENGIS ET AL.

Examiner

Francisco C. Prats

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-28-01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1651

**DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 4, 2005, has been entered.

Claims 21-41 are pending and are examined on the merits.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1651

Claims 21, 24-36 and 41 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,696,563.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the '563 patent recite an "intermediate food product or food" (claim 19) prepared by a set of steps substantially similar to the steps recited in the claims under examination.

Specifically, the food product recited in the '563 patent claims is made by a process comprising the same amylosucrase synthesis step (see, e.g., patented claim 7), the same heating step (see, e.g. patented claim 9), and the same retrogradation step of cooling to a temperature as low as freezing (see, e.g., patented claim 7), as recited in the claims under examination, as presently amended. Thus, while the patented claims and the claims under examination do not recite products of identical scope, the two sets of claims clearly overlap to a very significant degree. Moreover, because the patented claims recite the product as a food, method claim 41 under examination is inherently disclosed, since ingestion of the "food" from the patented claims will inherently result in prevention of gastrointestinal disorders. A terminal disclaimer is properly required.

Art Unit: 1651

Claims 21-41 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,696,563 in view of Kossman et al (WO 95/31553) and Brown (WO 96/08261).

As discussed above, the claims of the '563 patent recite a retrograded product, and food products comprising the retrograded product, prepared by the same basic steps recited in the claims under examination -- synthesis by amylosucrase, heating, and retrogradation. The claims of the '563 patent do not recite all of the uses recited in the claims under examination. However, Kossman describes the production of a linear  $\alpha$ -1,4 glucan from sucrose, using amylosucrase, and the use of the glucan in foods and pharmaceuticals. Thus, one of ordinary skill practicing the invention recited in the claims of the '563 patent, recognizing that a very similar product was useful in preparing pharmaceutical compositions, including the "enrobing" effect recited in the claims under examination, clearly would have considered the subject matter recited in the claims under examination obvious in view of Kossman. Moreover, in view of the fact that Brown directly discloses the suitability of resistant starches of the type recited in the claims of the '563 patent as carriers for bifidobacteria, such a use clearly must be considered obvious. Moreover, the

Art Unit: 1651

determination of suitable particle sizes and polymer lengths would have matters of routine optimization on the part of the artisan of ordinary skill practicing the invention recited in the claims of the '563 patent, and therefore would have been considered obvious variations on the patented claims.

In sum, Kossman, and Brown demonstrate that one of ordinary skill would have considered the uses, recited in the claims under examination herein, of the retrograded amylosucrase-synthesized linear glucan, obvious over the claims of the '563 patent. A terminal disclaimer is properly required.

As discussed immediately above, claims 21-41 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from the claims of commonly assigned U.S. Pat. 6,696,563. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Pat. 6,696,563, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under

Art Unit: 1651

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.


No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Francisco C. Prats whose telephone number is 571-272-0921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Francisco C. Prats  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1651

FCP